

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

LUFKIN DIVISION

URIYAH REED	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:24-CV-165
UNKNOWN BADGER, ET AL.	§	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff Uriyah Reed, a prisoner previously confined at the Gib Lewis Unit of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This action was referred to the undersigned magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.

Discussion

On June 21 and 27, 2024, documents mailed to Plaintiff at his last known address, were returned to the court as undeliverable. Eastern District of Texas Local Rule CV-11(d) requires *pro se* litigants to keep the clerk advised in writing of their current address. As of this date, Plaintiff has not provided the court with his current address.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) authorizes the district court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or to comply with a court order. *Griggs v. S.G.E. Mgmt.*, 905 F.3d 835, 844 (5th Cir. 2018); *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998). “The power to invoke this sanction is necessary in order to prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases

and to avoid congestion in the calendars of the District Courts.” *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-30 (1962); *Martinez v. Johnson*, 104 F.3d 769, 772 (5th Cir. 1997).

Without a current mailing address, the court is unable to contact Plaintiff or proceed with this action. Therefore, Plaintiff’s failure to comply with the Local Rules warrants dismissal without prejudice for want of prosecution.

Recommendation

This action should be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

Objections

Within fourteen days after receipt of the magistrate judge’s report, any party may serve and file written objections to the findings of facts, conclusions of law and recommendations of the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings of facts, conclusions of law and recommendations contained within this report within fourteen days after service shall bar an aggrieved party from the entitlement of *de novo* review by the district court of the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations and from appellate review of factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court, except on grounds of plain error. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72.

**SIGNED this the 28th day of August, 2024.**



---

Christine L Stetson  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE